

Docket No.: 30012798 US (1509-217)

PATENTREMARKS

The specification has been amended for clarity. The drawing has been amended to include reference numerals 16 and 17. Reference numeral 16 is mentioned and described in the specification at page 9, third full paragraph. Reference numeral 17 is added to the drawing and specification based on the description in the first full paragraph of page 10.

Claims 1, 3 and 13-15 have been amended to obviate (1) the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 1, (2) the objection to claim 3, and (3) the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2. Claims 2 and 4-6 have been amended for clarity and consistency.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Ginter et al. (U.S.P. 6,253,193). Presumably, the rejection is based on anticipation since it is under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

In rejecting claims 1-17 on Ginter, the Office Action refers to Figs. 1-11 and column 13, lines 5-16 and 53 of Ginter, a patent having 314 total pages, including 146 sheets of drawings, 321 columns of specification and two claims. The Office Action also includes quotations from various unidentified portions of Ginter.

One of the quotations on page 4 of the Office Action, is relied on to disclose a marker for identifying the location of a remote policy enforcement server appropriate to requested content. However, applicants are unable to discern how this quotation discloses such a marker. Explanation is requested. The Office Action relies on items 200f, 200c, 200b, 202, 216, 205, 122, 104, 110, 108 and Figs. 1, 2, 4 and 7, as well as a quotation at the top of page 5 to disclose transmitting a request on behalf of a client platform for a clear content version of content requested by a client platform from a content provider in response to the requirements of the remote policy enforcement server being met. Again, the applicants ask that the Examiner explain how these relied on portions of Ginter disclose the foregoing. The Office Action also relies on Figs. 1-10 of Ginter to disclose markers that are embedded in a data stream and are only recognizable and interpretable by a specific means in the proxy service. The Examiner must explain how Figs. 1-10 disclose such a feature.

Without the requested explanations the Office Action does not establish a prima facie case of anticipation.

Docket No.: 30012798 US (1509-217)

PATENT

Claims 18 and 19 have been added to provide applicants with the protection to which they are deemed entitled.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance is in order.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. ERICKSON et al.



Allan M. Lowe
Registration No. 19,641

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Telephone: 703-684-1111
Facsimile: 970-898-0640
Date: September 27, 2005
AML/sj

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW
Sheila R. Jallow
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION
Sheila R. Jallow Sept. 27, 2005
SIGNATURE DATE
573-273-8300
FACSIMILE NUMBER